

December 10, 2022

Hon. Edgardo Ramos  
Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse  
40 Foley Square Courtroom 619  
New York, NY 10007

**Re: *Brook v. Ruotolo et al.*, 1:22-cv-06173-ER (S.D.N.Y.)**

Your Honor:

I am the Plaintiff *pro se* and write in accordance with your individual practice rules to correct the record regarding a misleading statement in Assistant Attorney General Steven Sutro's December 9, 2022-letter (Doc.86).

In Mr. Sutro's December 9-letter, Mr. Sutro says: "[W]e respectfully request a one-week extension of time, from December 13, 2022, to December 20, 2022, to file Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the Complaint. ... We have requested consent from Plaintiff *pro se* Adam Brook but have received no response." I first received a request from Mr. Sutro for such an extension of time by email on December 9 at 10:26 AM EST.

It would seem to me that implicit in your practice rules' requirement that a party requesting an extension of time contact the opposing party to determine if they consent to the extension request is that the party making the extension request give the opposing party adequate time to respond to the extension request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Adam Brook MD".

Adam Brook, M.D., Ph.D.

Plaintiff *pro se*

813 Delmar Way Apt. 306

Delray Beach, FL 33483

(415) 516-0787

[brook1231@gmail.com](mailto:brook1231@gmail.com)